



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/686,447	10/10/2000	Carolyn Faour	0544MH-40015	5064

7590 05/20/2004

CHRISTOPHER W. KENNERLY, ESQ  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
2001 ROSS AVE., SUITE 600  
DALLAS, TX 75201

EXAMINER
----------

SHAH, NILESH R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2127

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2004

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

3

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/686,447

Applicant(s)

FAOUR ET AL.

Examiner

Nilesh R Shah

Art Unit

2127

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 March 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-7, 9-15 and 17-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-7, 9-15, 17-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 October 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1 -3, 5-7, 9-15, 17-35 are presented for examination.

#### ***Drawings***

This application, filed under former 37 CFR 1.60, lacks formal drawings. The informal drawings filed in this application are acceptable for examination purposes. When the application is allowed, applicant will be required to submit new formal drawings. In unusual circumstances, the formal drawings from the abandoned parent application may be transferred by the grant of a petition under 37 CFR 1.182.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1 -3, 5-7, 9-15, 17-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross et al (5,802,253) (hereinafter Gross) and further in view of Murphy, Jr. et al ((5,481,707) (hereinafter Murphy)

Art Unit: 2127

4. As per claim 1, Gross teaches a method for handling jobs within a computer system, comprising:

placing the work item into a particular queue in a plurality of queues based at least in part on the category of the work item, each queue in the plurality of queues being for storing work items representing jobs to be performed (col. 7 lines 54-63);

in turn, opening the work item in the particular queue in response to a request from a business process, and executing one or more tasks on the work item, each task being for resolving at least a portion of the job represented by the work item by resolving at least a portion of the customer-generated request (col. 7 lines 54-63, col. 5 lines 55-58).

5. Gross does not specifically teach the use of a state or change in history in a work item.
6. Murphy teaches a request for a job to be performed, generating a item representing the job to be performed, the work item comprising, a category, a state, a change history, and a description of the job represented by the work item, the job comprising a customer-generated request (col. 11 lines 26-50);

after executing the one or more tasks on the work item modifying the state of the work item in response to execution of the one or more tasks (col. 11 lines 42-50);

Art Unit: 2127

updating the change history of the work item in response to execution of the one or more tasks (col. 11 lines 58-65);

if the job represented by the work item is complete, archiving the work item (col. 11 lines 42-50, col. 15 lines 56-62); and

if the job represented by the work item is not yet complete, placing the work item into queue one of the plurality of queues based at least in part on one or more tasks to be executed on the work item(col. 11 lines 42-50, col. 15 lines 56-62).

7. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Gross and Murphy in order to maintain accurate state information. By have accurate state information one is able to determine which tasks are operating properly thus being able to monitor the entire system in a more efficient manner.
8. As per claim 2, Murphy teaches a method wherein the step executing a task of comprises modifying the work item (col. 11 lines 42-50).
9. As per claim 3, Gross teaches a method wherein executing a task comprises one or more of sending an e-mail to a person(col. 4 lines 6-24); and sending a fax to a person(col. 4 lines 6-24, col. 5 lines 23-59).

10. As per claim 5, Gross teaches a method, wherein executing a task comprises moving the work item to a queue different from its present queue (col. 7 lines 54-63, col. 5 lines 55-58).
11. As per claim 6, Gross teaches a method wherein one or more tasks comprises:  
invoking one or more composite actions, each of the one or more composite actions including a rule and at least one task to be executed as a result of evaluation of the rule (Fig. 8, col 4 lines 60-65).  
  
evaluating the rule for a for each of the one or more composite actions and executing the task corresponding to the evaluation of the rule (Fig. 9 col. 6 lines 34-37).
12. As per claim 7, Gross teaches a method wherein the work item further comprises an identification of a party that created the work item (col. 4 lines 45-65, col. 5 lines 36-67).
13. As per claim 9, Gross teaches a method wherein the work item further comprise comprises a due date for the work item indicating when the job represented by the work item should be resolved (col. 5 lines 36-67)
14. As per claim 10, Gross teaches a method wherein the work item further comprises a current location for the work item, the current location for the work item identifying the

Art Unit: 2127

queue in which the work item has been placed (col. 7 line 35 –col. 7 line 33, col. 58 lines 4-9)

15. As per claim 11, Gross teaches a system for handling jobs within a computer system, comprising:

one or more memory units operable to store a plurality of queues, each queue in the plurality of queues being for storing one or more work items(col. 7 lines 54-63); and

place the work item into a particular queue in the plurality of queues based at least in part on the category of the work item, each queue in the plurality of queues for storing work items representing jobs to be performed (col. 7 lines 54-63);

in turn, open the work item in the particular queue in response to a request from a business process, and executing one or more tasks on the work item, each task being for resolving at least a portion of the, job represented by the work item(col. 7 lines 54-63, col. 5 lines 55-58); and

archive the work item if the job represented by the work item is complete (col. 1 lines 50-54). Gross does not specifically teach the use of changing the state of an item.

one or more processing units collectively operable to generate, in response to receiving a request for a job to be performed, a plurality o work items, item representing the job to

Art Unit: 2127

be performed, each the work item having comprising a category, a state, a history, and a description of the job represented by the work item(col. 11 lines 26-50);

after executing the one or more tasks on the work item modify the state of the work item in response to execution of the one or more tasks and update the change history of the work item in response to execution of the one or more tasks(col. 11 lines 26-50);;

place the work item into one of the plurality of queues based at least in part on one or more tasks to be executed on the work item if the job represented by the work item is not yet complete (col. 11 lines 33-35).

16. As per claim 12, Gross teaches a system wherein the one or more processing units execute at least one task by invoking one or more composite actions, each composite action being stored in the one or more memory units and comprising; a rule to be evaluated (Fig. 9 col. 6 lines 34-37); and

at least one task to be performed executed as a result of evaluation of the rule(Fig. 8, col. 4 lines 60-65).

17. As per claim 13, Gross teaches a system, wherein the rule evaluates to a value of true or false (Fig. 8, col. 4 lines 60-65, col. 6 lines 34-37).



18. As per claim 14, Gross teaches a system further comprising a set of rules to be evaluated if there is no rule to be evaluated (Fig. 8, col. 4 lines 60-65, col. 6 lines 34-37).
19. As per claim 15, Gross teaches a system wherein the work items each comprises an identification of a party that created the work item (col. 7 line 35 –col. 7 line 33, col. 58 lines 4-9).
20. As per claim 17, Gross teaches a system wherein the work items each item further includes comprises a due date for the work item indicating when the job represented by the work item should be resolved (col. 5 lines 36-67).
21. As per claim 18, Gross teaches a system wherein the work items each item further includes comprises a current location for the work item, the current location for the work item identifying the queue in which the work item has been placed (col. 7 line 35 –col. 7 line 33, col. lines 4-9).
22. As per claim 19, Gross teaches a method wherein the work item is a computer-implemented object (col. 7 lines 54-63).
23. As per claim 20, Gross teaches a method wherein the business process is automated such that the business process automatically opens the work item in the particular queue (col. 2 lines 4-21).

24. As per claim 21, Gross teaches a method wherein the work item persists until the job represented by the work item is completed (col. 1 lines 50-54).

25. As per claim 22, Murphy teaches a method wherein the state of the work item comprises one or more of an open state indicating that the work item is currently opened by a business process and is currently not available to be opened by another business process (col. 11 lines 33-36); and

a closed state indicating that the work item is waiting in its associated queue for one or more tasks to be performed on the work item by a business process(col. 11 lines 29-33).

26. As per claim 23, Gross teaches a method further comprising providing a plurality of composite actions, each composite action comprising:

a rule for determining an appropriate action to be performed on the work item (Fig. 9 col. 6 lines 34-37);

a first set of one or more actions to be performed if the rule evaluates to TRUE(Fig. 8, col. 4 lines 60-65, col. 6 lines 34-37);

a second set of one or more actions to be performed if the rule evaluates to FALSE(Fig. 8, col. 4 lines 60-65, col. 6 lines 34-37);

and wherein executing one or more tasks on the work item comprises invoking one or more of the plurality of composite actions (col. 2 lines 62-67).

27. As per claim 24, Gross teaches a method, wherein each category is associated with a composite action; and the method further comprises, in response to generating a work item, specifying the category of the work item based on the job represented by the work item, a rule associated with the composite action that is associated with the category of the work item determining the particular queue in which the work item should be placed (col. 5 lines 55-59, col. 7 lines 54-60).

28. As per claim 25, Gross teaches a method wherein the job comprises a customer problem associated with a product or service, the job being completed when the customer's problem is resolved (col. 1 lines 59-62).

29. Claims 26-28 are rejected based on claims 2, 3, and 5 above.

30. Claims 29-35 are rejected based on claims 19-25 above.

31. Applicant's arguments filed on 3/4/04 for claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-15 and 17-35 have been considered but they are not persuasive in view of new grounds of rejection.

### *Conclusion*

32. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 2127

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

33. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nilesh R Shah whose telephone number is 703-305-8105. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng An can be reached on 703-305-9678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2127

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

NS

May 12, 2004



**MENG-AL T. AN**  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100